UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
NEW ENGLAND
1 CONGRESS STREET, SUITE 1100
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02114-2023

FACT SHEET

DRAFT NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES) PERMIT TO DISCHARGE TO WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

NPDES PERMIT NO.: MA0022586

NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT:

Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School
2700 Regional Road
Dighton, MA 02764

NAME AND ADDRESS OF FACILITY WHERE DISCHARGE OCCURS:

Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School
2700 Regional Road
Dighton, MA 02764

RECEIVING WATER: Unnamed Tributary to the Segreganset
(Taunton River Watershed -MA62)

CLASSIFICATION: Class B - Warm Water

I. PROPOSED ACTION

The applicant has applied to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for re-issuance of their National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit to discharge into the designated receiving water. The current permit expired on October 6, 1992. An application was submitted on May 19, 1992 and an update to that application was submitted on December 12, 2003. This permit, after it becomes effective, will expire five (5) years from the effective date.

II. TYPE OF FACILITY, AND DISCHARGE LOCATION

The facility is engaged in the collection and treatment of wastewater from the Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School. The effluent is discharged to an unnamed tributary of the Segreganset River (See Figure 1).

The facility's discharge outfall is listed below:

Outfall	Description of Discharge	Outfall Location
001	Treated Effluent	Unnamed Tributary to the Segreganset River

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISCHARGE

A quantitative description of the effluent parameters based on recent discharge monitoring reports (DMRs) is shown on Table One of this fact sheet.

IV. LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS

The effluent limitations and monitoring requirements may be found in the draft NPDES permit.

V. PERMIT BASIS AND EXPLANATION OF EFFLUENT LIMITATION DERIVATION

A. PROCESS DESCRIPTION

The Dighton Rehoboth Regional High School has an extended aeration wastewater treatment system with chlorination for disinfection. This treatment system collects and treats wastewater from the high school which serves approximately 1000 students and staff.

B. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

1. Overview of Federal and State Regulations

EPA is required to consider technology and water quality requirements when developing permit effluent limits. Technology based treatment requirements represent the minimum level of control that must be imposed under Sections 402 and 301(b) of the Act. Pursuant to Section 301(b)(1)(B), publicly owned treatment works must achieve effluent limitations based on secondary treatment.

EPA regulations require NPDES permits to contain effluent limits more stringent than technology-based limits where more stringent limits are necessary to maintain or achieve federal or state water quality standards.

Under Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), discharges are subject to effluent limitations based on Water Quality Standards. The Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards include the requirements for the regulation and control of toxic constituents and also require that EPA criteria established pursuant to Section 304(a) of the CWA shall be used unless site specific criteria are established. The State will limit or prohibit discharges of pollutants to surface waters to assure that surface water quality standards of the receiving waters are protected and maintained or attained.

The permit must limit any pollutant or pollutant parameter (conventional, non conventional, toxic, and whole effluent toxicity) that is or may be discharged at a level that caused, has reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of any water quality criterion [40 CFR §122.44(d)]. In determining reasonable potential, EPA considers existing controls on point and non-point sources of pollution, variability of the pollutant in the effluent, sensitivity of the species to toxicity and, where appropriate, the dilution of the effluent in the receiving water.

During the permit development, a review of the Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) was conducted. The analysis indicates the facility has frequently exceeded the existing permit limits. In particular, limits for fecal coliform and total residual chlorine were exceeded. A quantitative description of the wastewater treatment system discharge in terms of effluent parameters based on DMRs is shown in Table One.

The draft permit contains more stringent effluent limitations than the existing permit given that the existing permit was last issued October 6, 1987 and water quality criteria have since become more stringent. Also, based on a field visit by EPA, MassDEP, and a Dighton-Rehoboth School representative (October 14, 2004), it was apparent there is little to no flow provided by the intermittent stream during low flow months. Thus, the dilution of the discharge during low flow months is negligible. The receiving water flow used to calculate effluent limits is therefore zero, resulting in a dilution factor of one.

The draft permit contains limits for flow, fecal coliform bacteria, total residual chlorine (TRC), biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), total suspended solids (TSS) and whole effluent toxicity. The proposed limits for TRC, BOD, and TSS are more stringent than the existing permit limits. Ammonia monitoring will be required and the data will be examined for potential future limits.

On March 9, 2006 a meeting was held to present the draft effluent limits, and discuss options to either meet the new limits or eliminate the current discharge via subsurface disposal. Based on a subsequent letter from the Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District (School District), dated March 13, 2006, EPA recognizes that the School District is currently exploring alternatives for the Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School WWTF, including, but not limited to, replacing/upgrading the WWTF, connecting to a municipal sewage system, and installing a leaching field and discharging via subsurface disposal (Martin 2006). Proposal estimates were due to the school district by April 13th, 2006, and the school committee was scheduled to select a contractor at their next scheduled meeting on April 25th, 2006 (Martin 2006).

It is anticipated that the existing WWTF will not be able to comply with the effluent limits in the draft permit and it is anticipated that EPA will issue an administrative order that addresses the permit violations and requires a specified timeframe to meet the permit limits or eliminate the discharge.

2. Water Quality Standards; Designated Uses; Outfall 001

The receiving water, an unnamed tributary of the Segreganset River, is classified as Class B Water in the Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards, 314 CMR 4.05(4)(a). Class B waters are designated as a habitat for fish, other aquatic life, and wildlife, and for primary and secondary contact recreation. They shall be suitable for irrigation and other agricultural uses and for compatible industrial cooling and process uses. The waters should have consistently good aesthetic value.

Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires states to identify those waterbodies that are not expected to meet surface water quality standards after the implementation of technology-based controls and, as such require the development of total maximum daily loads (TMDL). The *Massachusetts Year 2002 Integrated List of Waters* and the proposed *Massachusetts Year 2004 Integrated List of Waters* (Section 303(d) List), places the Segreganset River is Category Three: No Uses Assessed. Category Three contains waters for which insufficient, or no information was available to assess any uses. Also included in Category Three are waters for which assessments were determined to be insufficient for 303(d) listing.

Although the unnamed tributary and the Segreganset River are not listed as requiring a TMDL, the Tauton River, to which they drain, appears on the current 2002 and proposed 2004 Section 303(d) lists in Category Five: Waters Requiring a TMDL. The entire Tauton River requires a TMDL for pathogens, while two segments require a TMDL for organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen.

Available Dilution

Water quality based limitations are established with the use of a calculated available dilution. The design flow is 5,000 gallons per day [0.0050 million gallons per day; (MGD)] or 0.008 cubic feet per second (cfs). The existing permit has a permitted average monthly flow of 0.008 MGD. The draft permit was changed to reflect the accurate design flow for the WWTF, as it appears on the NPDES application form.

On October 13th, 2004, a site visit was conducted by EPA and MassDEP-SERO, along with a Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School representative, to tour the facility and locate the effluent discharge outfall. It was found that the discharge was into a small stream. There was no flowing water upstream of the discharge. The receiving water flow used to calculate effluent limits is therefore zero, resulting in a dilution factor of one.

OUTFALL 001 - CONVENTIONAL POLLUTANTS

Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD_5) - Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) are subject to the secondary treatment requirements set forth at 40 CFR 133.102 (b)(1), (2) and 40 CFR 122.45 (f). The secondary treatment limitations are monthly average BOD_5 concentration of 30 mg/l, weekly average concentration of 45 mg/l. However, given the absence of dilution, effluent limitations of 10 mg/l average monthly and 15 mg/l average weekly for BOD_5 are included in the draft permit based on water quality considerations. The maximum daily concentration shall be reported. The mass limitations for BOD_5 are based on 5,000 gallons per day design flow.

Total Suspended Solids (TSS) - Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) are subject to the secondary treatment requirements set forth at 40 CFR 133.102 (b)(1), (2) and 40 CFR 122.45 (f). The secondary treatment limitations are average monthly TSS concentration of 30 mg/l, weekly average concentration of 45 mg/l. However, given the absence of dilution, effluent limitations of 10 mg/l monthly average and 15 mg/l average weekly for TSS are included in the draft permit based on water quality considerations. The maximum daily concentration shall be reported. The mass limitations for TSS are based on 5,000 gallons per day design flow.

BOD_5 and TSS Mass Loading Calculations:

Calculations of maximum allowable loads for average weekly, and average monthly BOD_5 and TSS are based on the following equation:

$L = C \times DF \times 8.34$ or $L = C \times DF \times 3.79$ where:

L = Maximum allowable load in lbs/day.
C = Maximum allowable effluent concentration for reporting period in mg/l. Reporting periods are average monthly and average weekly.
DF = Design flow of facility in MGD.

8.34 = Factor to convert effluent concentration in mg/l and design flow in MGD to lbs/day.
3.79 = Factor to convert effluent concentration in mg/l and design flow in MGD to kgs/day.

(Concentration limit) [15] X 8.34 (Constant) X 0.005 (design flow) = 0.626 lb/day, rounded to 0.63 lb/day

(Concentration limit) [10] X 8.34 (Constant) X 0.005 (design flow) = 0.42 lb/day

Eighty-Five Percent (85%) BOD_5 and TSS Removal Requirement - the provisions of 40 CFR §133.102(3) requires that the 30 day average percent removal for BOD and TSS be not less than 85%.

Settleable Solids - The monitoring requirements for settleable solids have been removed from this permit. They are no longer required as a condition for state certification under Section 401 of the CWA.

pH - The draft permit includes proposed pH limitations which are required by state water quality standards, and are at least as stringent as pH limitations set forth at 40 CFR 133.102(c). Class B waters shall be in a range of 6.5 through 8.3 standard units and not more than 0.5 standard units outside of the background range. There shall be no change from background conditions that would impair any use assigned to this class.

Fecal Coliform Bacteria - The numerical limitations for fecal coliform are based on state certification requirements under Section 401(a)(1) of the CWA, as described in 40 CFR 124.53 and 124.55. These limitations are also in accordance with the Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards 314 CMR 4.05 (3)(b) 4.

The proposed limits in the draft permit are 200 colony forming units (cfu)/100 ml geometric mean and 400 colony forming units (cfu)/100 ml maximum daily. The monitoring frequency for fecal coliform has been increased to three samples per week and must be collected concurrent with sampling for Total Residual Chlorine. In addition, the results for each sample must be submitted with the DMRs on a separate sheet, and include the date and time of each sample. Samples shall be collected downstream of the chlorine contact chamber and prior to commingling with other sources.

OUTFALL 001 - NON-CONVENTIONAL POLLUTANTS

Total Residual Chlorine (TRC) - Chlorine is a toxic chemical. DMRs show a chlorine residual ranging between 0.01 and 31.7 mg/l with an average of 2.2 mg/l (n= 25). Please see Table One for details.

The draft permit includes total residual chlorine limitations which are based on state water quality standards [Title 314 CMR 4.05(5)(e)] and *the State's Implementation Policy for the Control of Toxic Pollutants in Surface Waters, February 23, 1990.* Chlorine compounds produced by the chlorination of wastewater can be extremely toxic to aquatic life. As such, if the permittee chooses to upgrade the treatment facility and maintain the discharge , it should evaluate chlorination alternatives such as ultraviolet disinfection, as well as state of the art chlorination facilities which enable adequate control over chlorine dosing levels. Given the limitation of grab samples for ensuring that chlorine limits are complied with at all times, future permits may

require continuous chlorine monitoring to assure that toxic levels are not discharged to the receiving water.

The water quality standards for chlorine defined in the 2002 EPA National Recommended Water Quality Criteria for freshwater are 19 ug/l daily maximum and 11 ug/l monthly average in the receiving water. Given the dilution factor of 1, total residual chlorine limits have been calculated as 19 ug/l maximum daily and 11 ug/l average monthly.

The sampling frequency has been changed to five (5) times per week from once (1) per day since the facility is a school, and not typically occupied on weekends. Total residual chlorine samples must be collected concurrently with the (three per week) fecal coliform samples. Additionally, all total residual chlorine results must be recorded, including the date and time of each sample, on a separate sheet and submitted with the monthly DMRs.

Total Residual Chlorine Limitations:

(acute criteria * dilution factor) = Acute (Maximum Daily)
(19 ug/l x 1) = 19 ug/l

(chronic criteria * dilution factor) = Chronic (Average Monthly)
(11 ug/l x 1) = 11 ug/l

Total Ammonia Nitrogen, as N - Ammonia is a toxic pollutant which may be harmful to aquatic organisms. EPA is required to limit any pollutant that is or may be discharged at a level that caused, or has reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion of any water quality criterion [40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(vi)]. The water quality standards for ammonia are referenced in the National Recommended Water Quality Criteria: 2002 and are defined in the 1999 Update of Ambient Water Quality for Ammonia. Given that total ammonia, as nitrogen, has not monitored in previous permits, insufficient data exists to determine whether permit limits are necessary.

Therefore, the draft permit contains monitoring requirement for total ammonia (as nitrogen) on a weekly sampling basis. Data from this monitoring will be used to determine whether future permit limits for ammonia are necessary.

Copper: Given the use of copper pipes for drinking water at the Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School, it is anticipated that copper will be present at some level in the effluent. Based on results from the Whole Effluent Toxicity tests (see below), EPA will make a determination whether the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an exceedence of water quality standards for copper. If the water quality criteria for copper are exceeded (acute criterion 3.64 ug/l; chronic criterion 2.74 ug/l), this permit will be reopened and modified to include copper limits.

Phosphorous: Phosphorous and other nutrients (i.e., nitrogen) promote the growth of nuisance algae and rooted aquatic plants. Typically, elevated levels of nutrients will cause excessive algal and/or plant growth resulting in reduced water clarity and poor aesthetic quality. Through respiration, and the decomposition of dead plant matter, excessive algae and plant growth can reduce in-stream dissolved oxygen concentrations to levels that could negatively impact aquatic life and/or produce strong unpleasant odors.

Given that the effluent discharges to a receiving water with indiscernible flow, eutrophic conditions may be present, particularly during the summer. Thus, monitoring requirements are included in the permit to evaluate whether eutrophic conditions exist in the receiving water. Total phosphorous shall be monitored once per week and reported in the monthly DMRs. Based on the monitoring results, this permit may be reopened and modified to include phosphorous limits.

OUTFALL 001 - WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY (WET)

Under Section 301(b)(1)(C) of the CWA, discharges are subject to effluent limitations based on water quality standards. The Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards include the following narrative statement and requires that EPA criteria established pursuant to Section 304(a)(1) of the CWA be used as guidance for interpretation of the following narrative criteria: All surface waters shall be free from pollutants in concentrations or combinations that are toxic to humans, aquatic life or wildlife.

National studies conducted by the EPA have demonstrated that domestic sources contribute toxic constituents. These constituents include metals, chlorinated solvents, aromatic hydrocarbons and others. The Region's current policy is to include toxicity testing requirements in all permits, while Section 101(a)(3) of the CWA specifically prohibits the discharge of toxic pollutants in toxic amounts.

Based on the potential for toxicity resulting from domestic sewage, and in accordance with EPA national and regional policy, the draft permit includes chronic and acute toxicity limitations and monitoring requirements. (See e.g. "Policy for the Development of Water Quality-Based Permit Limitations for Toxic Pollutants", 50 Fed. Reg. 30,784 (July 24, 1985); see also, EPA's "Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control", September, 1991.)

Pursuant to EPA Region I policy, a minor discharge having a dilution ratio of less than 10:1 requires 7-day chronic and modified acute toxicity testing four (4) times per year. The principal advantages of biological techniques are: (1) the effects of complex discharges of many known and unknown constituents can be measured only by biological analyses; (2) bioavailability of pollutants after discharge is best measured by toxicity testing including any synergistic effects of pollutants; and (3) pollutants for which there are inadequate chemical analytical methods or criteria can be addressed. Therefore, toxicity testing is being used in conjunction with pollutant specific control procedures to control the discharge of toxic pollutants.

The draft permit requires that the permittee conduct 7-day chronic and modified acute WET testing for the Outfall 001 effluent four (4) per year (quarterly) and that each test include the use of two species, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* and *Pimphales promelas*, in accordance with EPA Region I protocol to be found in permit Attachment A.

As a condition of this permit, the testing requirements may be reduced if certain conditions are met. The permit provision anticipates that the permittee may wish to request a reduction in the WET testing. After one year of consecutive WET tests, demonstrating compliance with the permit limits for whole effluent toxicity, the permittee may submit a written request to the EPA

seeking a review of toxicity test results. The EPA will review the test results and pertinent information to make a determination. The permittee is required to continue testing at the

frequency and species specified in the permit until the permit is either formally modified or until the permittee receives a certified letter from the EPA indicating a change in the permit conditions.

VI. SLUDGE CONDITIONS

Section 405(d) of the CWA requires that EPA develop technical regulations regarding the use and disposal of sewage sludge. These regulations are found at 40 CFR part 503 and apply to any facility engaged in the treatment of domestic sewage. The CWA further requires that these conditions be implemented through permits.

The Dighton-Rehoboth WWTF has a sludge storage tank, which is pumped approximately every three months and disposed of at an approved location.

VII. ANTI-BACKSLIDING

Section 402(o) of the CWA provides, generally, that the effluent limitations of a renewed, reissued, or modified permit must be at least as stringent as the comparable effluent limitations in the previous permit. Unless certain limited exceptions are met,

"backsliding" from effluent limitations contained in previously issued permits that were based on CWA §§ 301(b)(1)(C) or 303 is prohibited. EPA has also promulgated anti-backsliding regulations, which are found at 40 CFR § 122.44(l). Unless statutory and regulatory backsliding requirements are met, the limits in the reissued permit must be at least as stringent as those in the previous permit.

VIII. ANTI-DEGRADATION

The Massachusetts Anti-degradation Policy is found at Title 314 CMR 4.04. All existing uses of the unnamed tributary of the Segreganset River must be protected. This draft permit has discharge limits as or more stringent than the current permit with the exception of settleable solids which has been eliminated from the permit because MassDEP no longer requires it as a condition for obtaining state certification. There has been no change in the outfall location.

IX. ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT DETERMINATION (EFH)

Under the 1996 Amendments (PL 104-267) to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. § 1801 et seq. (1998)), EPA is required to consult with the National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS) if EPA's action or proposed actions that it funds, permits, or undertakes, may adversely impact any essential fish habitat as: waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity (16 U.S.C. § 1802 (10)). Adversely impact means any impact which reduces the quality and/or quantity of EFH (50 C.F.R. § 600.910 (a)). Adverse effects may include direct (e.g., contamination or physical disruption), indirect (e.g., loss of prey, reduction in species' fecundity), site-specific or habitat-wide impacts, including individual, cumulative, or synergistic consequences of actions. Essential fish habitat is only designated for species for which federal fisheries management plans exist (16 U.S.C. § 1855(b) (1) (A)). EFH designations for New England were approved by the U.S. Department of Commerce on March 3, 1999.

It has been determined by EPA and NMFS that the unnamed tributary and the Segreganset River are not covered by the EFH designation for riverine systems. Therefore, a formal EFH consultation with NMFS is not required.

X. ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA) grants authority to and imposes requirements upon Federal agencies regarding endangered or threatened species of fish, wildlife, or plants ("listed species") and habitat of such species that has been designated as critical (a "critical habitat"). The ESA requires every Federal agency, in consultation with and with the assistance of the Secretary of Interior, to insure that any action it authorizes, funds, or carries out, in the United States or upon the high seas, is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. The

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) administers Section 7 consultations for freshwater species, where as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) administers Section 7 consultations for marine species and anadromous fish.

As the federal agency charged with authorizing the discharge from this facility, EPA consulted with the USFWS as required under section 7 (a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), for potential impacts to federally listed species. Based on an e-mail letter received from the USFWS January 31, 2006, it is EPA understanding that no federally-listed or proposed, threatened or endangered species or critical habitat, under the jurisdiction of the US Fish and Wildlife Service,

are known to occur in the Segreganset River or vicinity of the Dighton-Rehoboth WWTF. Furthermore, the effluent limitations and other permit requirements identified in this Fact Sheet are designed to be protective of all aquatic species.

XI. COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT

Although the Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School was previously identified within the coastal zone, EPA requested the Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management (MassCZM) office to re-evaluate and provide updated information regarding this location. In an email response (January 25, 2006), the MassCZM indicated that they have purview over the Segreganset River up to Elm Street/Route 44, and that the high school is several miles upstream from this point Therefore, the Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School WWTF was determined to be outside the coastal zone.

XII. STATE PERMIT CONDITIONS

The NPDES Permit is issued jointly by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) under federal and state law, respectively. As such, all the terms and conditions of the permit are, therefore, incorporated into and constitute a discharge permit issued by the MassDEP Commissioner who designates signature authority to the Director of the Division of Watershed Management pursuant to M.G.L. Chap. 21, §43.

XIII. STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The staff of the MassDEP has reviewed the draft permit. EPA has requested permit certification by the State pursuant to 40 CFR § 124.53 and expects that the draft permit will be certified.

XIV. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND PROCEDURES FOR FINAL DECISION

All persons, including applicants, who believe any condition of the draft permit is inappropriate must raise all issues and submit all available arguments and all supporting material for their arguments in full by the close of the public comment period, to the U.S. EPA, Office of Ecosystem Protection, MA Unit, One Congress Street, Suite-1100, Boston, Massachusetts 02114. Any person, prior to such date, may submit a request in writing for a public hearing to consider

the draft permit to EPA and the State Agency. Such requests shall state the nature of the issues proposed to be raised in the hearing. Public hearings may be held after at least thirty days public notice whenever the Regional Administrator finds that response to this notice indicates a significant public interest. In reaching a final decision on the draft permit, the Regional Administrator will respond to all significant comments and make these responses available to the public at EPA's Boston office.

Following the close of the comment period and after a public hearing, if such a hearing is held, the Regional Administrator will issue a final permit decision and forward a copy of the final decision to the applicant and each person who has submitted written comments or requested notice.

XV. EPA AND STATE CONTACTS

Additional information concerning the draft permit may be obtained between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding holidays from:

Jeanne Voorhees
Office of Ecosystem Protection
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
One Congress Street, Suite-1100 (CPU)
Boston, MA 02114-2023
Telephone: (617) 918-1686

Paul Hogan
MA Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Watershed Management
Surface Water Discharge Permit Program
627 Main Street, 2nd Floor
Worcester, Massachusetts 01608
Telephone: (508)767-2796

_____
Date

Linda M. Murphy, Director
Office of Ecosystem Protection
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

REFERENCES

Martin. 2006. Letter to Ms. Jeanne Voorhees (USEPA) from Mr. Paul Martin (Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District) regarding *NPDES Permit MA0022586, Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School, North Dighton, MA*, dated March 22, 2006.

MassDEP. 2002. *Massachusetts Year 2002 Integrated List of Waters. Proposed Listing of the Condition of Massachusetts' Waters Pursuant to Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.* Division of Watershed Management , Watershed Planning Program; Worcester, Massachusetts. CN: 125.1; 125.2 and 125.3.

MassDEP. 2004. *Massachusetts Year 2004 Integrated List of Waters. Proposed Listing of the Condition of Massachusetts' Waters Pursuant to Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.* Division of Watershed Management , Watershed Planning Program; Worcester, Massachusetts. CN: 155.0.

MassCZM. 2006. Email correspondence, January 25, 2006, from Todd Callaghan (MassCZM) to Phil Colarusso (USEPA).

NMFS. 2006. Telephone conversation, January, 30th, 2006, Phil Colarusso (USPEA) and Chris Boelke (NMFS).